

**DCSS P3 PROGRAM
ATTORNEY STAFFING WORKGROUP
OCTOBER 17, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

I. GENERAL

On Tuesday, October 17, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Project, Attorney Staffing Workgroup held its last official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Antonia Agerbek, County Co-Leader (DDA, Sonoma County)
- ☒ Linda Anisman (Director/DDA, Inyo County)
- ☐ Janet Ballou (Child Support Attorney, CCSAS)
- ☒ Janice Doi (Supervising DDA, Santa Clara County)
- ☒ Mike Farrell, DCSS Co-Leader (Program Improvement Manager, DCSS)
- ☒ Hossein Moftakhar, DCSS Analyst (Statistical Analyst, DCSS)
- ☒ Julie Paik (Facilitator, Los Angeles County)
- ☒ Bruce Patterson (Orange County)
- ☒ Shari M Quadri (San Bernadino County)
- ☐ Judith Grimes (San Joachin County)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☒ Jim Hennessey, Facilitator (Policy Studies, Inc.)
- ☐ Barb Saunders, Resource (OCSE Rep---DC)

Housekeeping and meeting minute duties were addressed: Bruce Patterson is to submit meeting minutes.

II TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

Proposed Agenda

- Review public forums and questions & answers.
- Assess a notional cost and benefit for each recommendation
- Brainstorm a list of next steps for the final workgroup report (need not be limited to subject of our workgroup)
- Conduct final review and obtain consensus of the long report
- Identify two people (minimum) who will be ongoing resources to the Policy unit or others to clarify information for the workgroup

- Identify several people who will be peer reviewers for any products or changes to products to ensure consistency and accuracy of products
- Complete the P3 Project Evaluation Survey

III. REVIEW OF PUBLIC FORUMS AND QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

The public forums for both the Sacramento and Los Angeles were discussed. The general nature of the questions received and answers presented were discussed. The draft of the questions and answers as taken by SRA were also reviewed and changes to the answers were captured by Jim Hennessey. There were no unanswered questions for the Workgroup to provide answers.

The Workgroup decided that the input received from the public forums was not different than the recommendations already developed by the Workgroup, therefore the Workgroup decided not to change its direction or recommendations.

The Los Angeles Public Forum has been tentatively rescheduled for November 13, 2000. Bruce agreed that he would still attend the public forum although he has recently been promoted and will return to the criminal division at the end of this week. Julie will check her schedule and tentatively agreed to attend the public forum for the evening session.

During the meeting, Jim telephoned one of the Steering Committee members to clarify the Workgroup's role at the Fatherhood Conference in November in Irvine as Peggy Jensen mentioned that this would be another public forum. Jim reported that the Workgroup members will not be attending the conference.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF NOTIONAL COSTS

Recommendation	Cost (\$,\$\$,,\$\$)	Benefit (\$,\$\$,,\$\$)
Data collection & analysis	\$	\$\$\$
County-by-county study	\$\$	\$\$\$
Establish definitions and staffing standards	\$	\$\$\$
Reassess staffing standards as needed	50¢	\$\$\$

The workgroup developed the above notional costs for each of its four recommendations and noted that all four of the recommendations must be done to arrive at staffing standards/ratios. The benefit outweighs the costs in implementing the four recommendations.

V. NEXT STEPS

The Workgroup felt strongly that any staffing study should include support staff, accounting staff and contract staff. The Workgroup also identified three other Next Steps not directly related to the Staffing - Attorneys Workgroup that DCSS should undertake as follows:

1. DCSS should provide in a timely manner all necessary information to all the counties to accomplish their mission, goals, and objectives.
2. Through additional workgroup efforts, DCSS should continue the process of establishing goals and guidelines to accomplish uniformity amongst the counties.
3. Individuals working at the state and local program levels should be able to observe and understand what the other does to accomplish the program's mission, goals, and objectives.

VII LONG REPORT

The Workgroup reviewed the draft version of the long report and the revisions made to the main body of the report by SRA. It was noted that SRA made a few changes to grammar and style, but the only content change was the removal of a sentence from the third recommendation. The Workgroup felt that no content changes should have been made and decided to add the sentence back into the long report in a revised format so that sentence makes more sense. Telephone numbers, fax machine numbers, and e-mail addresses were updated for Workgroup members from DCSS.

Changes were noted and printed for the Workgroup members to take with them. Any additional changes that the members would like to make should be directed to Antonia no later than Monday October 23rd so that the final report will be ready for delivery to SRA by COB on Tuesday October 24th.

VIII. ONGOING RESOURCES

The Workgroup agreed that the members that would be ongoing resources for DCSS would include:

Linda Anisman as a small county representative;
Antonia Agerbek as a medium county representative;
Janice Doi as a large county representative; and
Mike Farrell as a DCSS representative.

IX. PEER REVIEWERS

The Workgroup agreed that since our workgroup is relatively small, all members would be peer reviewers for any revisions to the final report.

X. P3 PROJECT EVALUATION SURVEY

Jim informed the Workgroup that this survey has not been finalized yet and will be provided to each of the members to complete as soon as it is ready.